

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/108,705

Applicant(s)

Motoyama

Examiner

Kim Yen Vu

Group Art Unit

2722

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kim Yen Vu(3) Mr. Motoyama(2) Margo Livesay

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Nov 5, 1999Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☒ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: 37-48

Identification of prior art discussed:

Allen et al 5,394,458; Ulinski 5,325,156

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:


The applicant's representative discussed the claimed communication protocol over the prior art, Allen et al and Ulinski. The applicant will amend the claims to define the communication protocol over the prior art. The term "protocol identifier" was discussed as a proposed claim language. The applicant's representative will fax a draft claim for reaching an agreement with the examiner prior filing a response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

  
KIM YEN VU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2722

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Art Unit: 2722

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The applicant canceled claims 1-37, 50-70. The claims were originally numbered as 1-30, 32-70. Thus, the pending claims 38-49, under rule 37 CFR 1.126, are renumbered as 37-48.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 37, 42-43, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Allen et al 5,394,458.

Regarding claims 37, 42, 43, 48, Allen et al disclose a reproduction system in figures 1-2, having a communication interface 6 for transmitting information from a reproduction apparatus 1 (first device) to an administrative device 5 (second device) which identifies a unit in the reproduction apparatus 1 (type of first device), initializes a status database 20, and selects a symptom to diagnose the reasons and probabilities (condition) of the reproduction apparatus 1, column 5, lines 7-36. The information is transmitted from the reproduction apparatus 1 to the administrative device 5 via a telephone network and a modem 4, which uses a standard RS-232 protocol (determined protocol), column 3, line 30 to column 4, line 7.

Art Unit: 2722

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 38-41, 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al in view of Baum et al 5,577,105.

Regarding claims 38-41, 44-47, Allen et al disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except for including a plurality of protocols. The reproduction apparatus 1 (first device) connects to a communication interface 6 for communicating with the administrative device 5 (second device). The communication interface 6 has a modem 4 which includes a standard RS-232 protocol. The administrative device 5 is a computer equipped to receive and transmit information to and from the reproduction apparatus 1. The reproduction apparatus 1 communicates to the administrative device 5 on a routine basis. Thus, the communication protocol is a predetermined protocol between a copier 1 to a computer 5. Allen et al do not include a plurality of protocols. Baum et al teach a network interface module which includes a plurality of modems (each modem has different protocol parameters) for select appropriated protocol parameters for the incoming call in a data communication system, column 9. Thus, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time

Art Unit: 2722

the invention was made to include a plurality of protocols to the communication interface in Allen et al. To communicate with different communication devices the communication interface in Allen et al would have been modified to include the taught plural modems in Baum et al in order to select a respective protocol to communicate with an incoming call from a particular communication device.

6. Claims 37, 42-43, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ulinski 5,325,156.

Regarding claims 37, 42, 43, 48, Ulinski discloses a reprographic machine in figures 1-3, having a modem 48 for transmitting information from a reproduction apparatus 10 (first device) to a remote diagnostic site 60 (second device), via a public switched telephone network 50, column 3, lines 4-14. The remote diagnostic site 60 is a host computer 84 which includes a compiler 86 for communicating with a plurality of different machine types, and an addressable file 88 for storing the identities of all machines. When the received information from the reproduction apparatus 10 is a request for service, the information from file 88 is provided to a diagnostic subsystem 90, which determines the condition of the reproduction apparatus 10, then communicates back to the reproduction apparatus 10, column 5, lines 7-43. Ulinski does not explicitly disclose the use of a communication protocol. However, the modem 48 transmits information via the public switched telephone network 50 to the remote diagnostic site 60 (second device), which has the compiler 86 for converting all incoming information data into a common machine format. Thus, the modem 48 would have included a

Art Unit: 2722

communication protocol for communicating between the reproduction apparatus 10 to the remote diagnostic site 60. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the system in Ulinski to communicate with the remote diagnostic site by using predetermined protocol because the modem in Ulinski would have included a communication protocol for transmitting and receiving information between the reproduction apparatus and the remote diagnostic site.

7. Claims 38-41, 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ulinski 5,325,156 in view of Baum et al 5,577,105.

Regarding claims 38-41, 44-47, Ulinski discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except for including a plurality of protocols. The modem 48 transmits information via the public switched telephone network 50 to the remote diagnostic site 60 (second device), which has the compiler 86 for converting all incoming information data into a common machine format. The compiler 86 provides the remote diagnostic site 60 the ability to communicate with a plurality of different machine types. However, Ulinski does not explicitly include a plurality of protocols. Baum et al teach a network interface module which includes a plurality of modems (each modem has different protocol parameters) for select appropriated protocol parameters for the incoming call in a data communication system, column 9. Thus, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a plurality of protocols to the device in Ulinski. Therefore, the ability to communicate with different machine types of the remote diagnostic site in Ulinski

Art Unit: 2722

would have been modified to include the taught plural modems in Baum et al in order to select a respective protocol to communicate with an incoming call from a particular reproduction device.


8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kraslavsky 5,699,350 includes various protocols in a network interface for communicating with different types of devices.

Motoyama 5,649,120; 5,818,603; 5,887,216 are applicant's related patents.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim Yen Vu whose telephone number is (703) 305-4393. The Group facsimile phone number is (703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry) or (703) 308-9589 (for informal or draft communications, such as proposed amendments to be discussed at an interview; please label such communications "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



KIM YEN VU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2722  
September 8, 1999